

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 115

EA 029 091

AUTHOR Czaja, Marion; Prouty, Joan
TITLE Developing Leadership for the 21st Century: A Study of a Professional Development Center and Its Partnership with One School District.
PUB DATE 1998-03-00
NOTE 15p.; Paper prepared for the Annual National Conference on Creating the Quality School (7th, Arlington, VA, March 26-28, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Instructional Leadership; *Leadership Responsibility; Mentors; *Professional Development; Professional Personnel; Teacher Role; *Teachers

ABSTRACT

Teachers who are mentors often serve in a leadership capacity. In such a role, they demonstrate leadership skills as they influence the learning community. For this study, 116 elementary school teachers who had mentored preservice teachers completed a leadership school survey to determine if any significant difference could be seen among the means on the seven dimensions necessary to support teacher leadership: developmental focus, recognition, collegiality, autonomy, participation, open communication, and positive environment. Results of the analysis indicated no significant differences. The findings indicate that of the 6 factors with a possible total score of 35, teacher mentors ranked recognition the highest teacher-leadership factor and autonomy the lowest. Teachers in each of the seven varying mentoring experiences showed a range in scores that was more than half of the total score possible. The views of teacher-leadership factors varied enough to indicate that barriers to teacher leadership need to be identified and removed if mentoring is to serve as an effective strategy in developing and improving teacher leadership. (RJM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 420 115

**DEVELOPING LEADERSHIP FOR THE 21ST CENTURY:
A STUDY OF A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER
AND ITS PARTNERSHIP WITH ONE SCHOOL DISTRICT**

BY

DR. MARION CZAJA

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS

DR. JOAN PROUTY

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS

March, 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISTRIBUTE THIS MATERIAL IN
MICROFORM ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Czaja
J. Prouty
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

EA 029 091

Abstract
Developing Leadership for the 21st Century

Teachers who are mentors often serve in a leadership capacity demonstrating leadership skills and influencing the context for a learning community. One hundred and sixteen elementary teachers who had mentored preservice teachers in one or more ways in a Professional Development School completed the Teacher Leadership School Survey (Katzenmeyer and Katzenmeyer, 1997) to determine if any significant difference could be seen between the means on the 7 dimensions necessary to support teacher leadership—developmental focus, recognition, collegiality, autonomy, participation, open communication and positive environment. Data analysis through analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated no significant differences. Descriptive statistics indicated that of the six factors with a possible total score of 35, teacher mentors ranked teacher leadership factor recognition the highest and autonomy last. Teachers in each of the 7 varying mentoring experiences showed a range in scores that was more than half of the total score possible. Views of school teacher leadership factors varied enough to indicate that barriers to teacher leadership need to be recognized and removed if mentoring is to serve as an effective strategy to develop and improve teacher leadership for the 21st century.

Background and Introduction of the Study

Leadership for the 21st century has been and is being developed at many different levels of service in the public schools. Roles of students, teachers, parents, principals and others have been redefined as the education profession struggles to address the needs of all students—even as the diversity and numbers of this population surge. The need for improved leadership has been a focus of reform since *A Nation at Risk* (1983). Eight national goals more recently established by both Republicans and Democrats infer a need for better leadership in the public schools. As noted by Hart (1995, p. 9) schools today are often complex, chaotic places that stretch the top-down model of leadership to the breaking point. Teachers provide a ready source of educational expertise and a possible source of leadership. One avenue being pursued in preparing leaders for the 21st century is through professional development centers and schools (Smylie, 1996; Darling-Hammond et al., 1996; Dempsey, 1992; Hayes, et al., 1996; Lemleck et al., 1994; Berry and Catoe, 1994; McDaniel, Rice and Romerdahl, 1990; Gehrke and Romerdahl, 1992). This work focuses on leadership being demonstrated through developing and maintaining learning organizations (Senge, 1990). According to Senge, (1990, p. 359) efficacy of the organization is developed through increasing individuals' capacities *to lead* (author's emphasis). Five learning principles are involved—systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision and *team learning* (author's emphasis). Most, if not all of these principles can be seen in many of the professional development schools (PDSs) that have emerged in response to the stated need for reform.

A professional development center can be defined as a partnership between a public school and a university to target goals such as those outlined by Murray (1993): (1) having *all* students understand content, (2) having *all* goals of the school apply to *all* students, (3) using valid assessments to ascertain students' success in use of learning in real-world contexts, (4) valuing the professional teachers who model continual learning in collaborative contexts, (5) allowing teachers to have time to reflect, plan and consult to respond to student and contextual demands, and (6) developing a "center of inquiry that contributes to scholarly literature" (p. 67).

Another definition given by Darling-Hammond, Cobb and Bullmaster (1995) state that Professional Development Schools (PDSs) are "...a special case of school restructuring; they are collaborations among schools and universities that support the learning of prospective and experienced teachers by creating settings in which novices work with expert practitioners and university-based faculty (1995, p. 1)

The impact of professional development schools has been examined and sorted into five categories by Book (1996) and is reported in *The Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (Sikula, J., Buttery, T. and Geyton, E. Eds., 1996). Studies of Professional

Development Centers and Schools have focused on teacher attitudes, the cultures of the school and the university, roles for teachers, and teacher education. Darling-Hammond (1995) highlights one of these areas in emphasizing roles for teacher leaders. She writes that through PDSs, teachers have become collaborative decision-makers, peer coaches, mentors, teacher-educators, curriculum developers, researchers, university adjuncts, problem solvers, and assessment developers. Gehrke and Romerdahl (1997) add to the role of teacher leader the ability to share a vision, to employ many instructional techniques, to empower students, to seek to improve school goals continuously and to be creative. All of these roles described by Darling-Hammond and Gehrke and Romerdahl become essential in a fully developed learning community.

Most studies of the PDSs recognize the impact of context in developing teacher leadership (Book, 1996, p.201). Katzenmeyer and Moller (1996, p. 89) state that "growing" a healthy climate for teacher leaders is more difficult than assisting teachers to learn the skills to be leaders. They have identified seven dimensions that support teacher leadership. Using these dimensions, Katzenmeyer and Moller (1996, pp. 99,100) created a survey to indicate overall ratings on each of seven factors. In December of 1997, the survey was revised to increase its reliability to .9 or higher for all combined factors (Katzenmeyer, W. 1997).

1. Developmental focus - A learning community is in evidence. Administrators, teachers and staff assist one another in learning new knowledge and skills.
2. Recognition - Teachers are acknowledged in such a way that they believe others have confidence in them. Mutual respect exists. Processes of formal recognition are in place as well as informal means.
3. Autonomy - Initiative is encouraged and support and encouragement is offered to teachers who want to make changes to best serve students.
4. Collegiality- Collaboration is evident in solving instructional as well as behavior problems. Teachers often discuss instructional strategies, share materials and impact the teaching and learning processes of all in the school.
5. Participation - Input of teachers is critical to decision making. "A consensus process involving representatives of the entire faculty, parents, students, and other stakeholders is used to guide the work of the teachers and administrators" (p.100).
6. Open Communication - Communications are open and honest and people are not blamed when things go wrong. Teachers feel informed about what is happening in their school.
7. Positive Environment - A positive climate and effective administrators are in place. Teaming is often used as part of the learning process. Teachers are generally satisfied with the environment and are well respected by all.

Because mentoring is a primary way that teachers can demonstrate leadership, and develop and promote a leadership context on a campus as defined in the cited survey, teachers who had mentored in one or more ways over a 2 and 1/2 year period in collaboration with the Sam Houston Center for Professional Development were surveyed in a pilot study of six elementary schools in one school district to determine if there were any substantial

differences in the seven factors among those who had differing mentor experiences. In addition, the pilot study investigated the correlation of the types of mentoring experience and several demographic factors of teacher mentors as well as the view of school leadership factors by the 7 subsets of teacher mentors.

Context for the Study

Sam Houston Center for Professional Development

In this professional development center, the partnership was initiated in 1995-96 with 9 different organizations --Sam Houston State University, four school districts (which has grown to 28 districts), a regional education service center and three community colleges. A grant from the Texas Education Agency provided funds for a three year restructuring process. Goals of the Sam Houston Center for Professional Development (SHCPD) were to:

“1. Implement extensive, sequenced, field-based learning experiences for preservice teachers which focus on research-based practices in such areas as instruction, classroom management, assessment, and human development that are mutually beneficial for preservice teachers, classroom teachers, and children in the public schools, especially children in low-performing sites...

2. Facilitate, in partnership schools and across the university, technology use that is integrated with effective teaching practices and enhances preservice teacher preparation and professional staff development...

3. Implement *mentoring* (authors' emphasis) and other learning activities that enable preservice teachers, public school staff, and university faculty to better understand, respect, and meet the learning and social needs of a diverse population of students...

4. Develop and implement a rigorous internal and external evaluation plan for the continuous qualitative and quantitative assessment of student and teacher outcomes using a variety of public school and university accountability indicators...

5. Promote the collaboration of all stakeholders in planning, implementing, and assessing preservice teacher preparation and professional staff development activities” (SHSU, p. 5, 1995).

In the restructuring of the educational program, four levels or tiers of learning were identified for preservice teachers--those university students enrolled in the teacher education program. Each of the levels involves several key players that work collaboratively.

- **Level 1- Precollege and Career Exploration:** The purpose of this level is to recruit future educators (especially minorities) at the high school level. Exploration of teaching as

a career through active assistance to classroom teachers and career awareness fairs are typical activities at the high school level.

- **Level 2- Career Exploration and Personal Development:** During students' freshman and sophomore years preservice teachers have field-based learning experiences through several required courses such as Multicultural Influences on Learning and Introduction to Special Education. Community agencies such as YMCA programs, public library programs, day care centers, nursing homes and grandparent centers were sites as well as public schools.
- **Level 3- Field Based Methods:** During the junior year, thirty to forty hours of experience is gained through application of classroom learnings in a school setting. Elementary preservice teachers are supervised by professors and mentor teachers in a Reading/Language Arts block.
- **Level 4- Field Based Methods:** During the senior year, teaching mathematics and science, social studies and reading provide experience for preservice teachers in planning a series of lessons using current best teaching practices. Again, professors and mentor teachers are involved with supervising the preservice teachers.

Although restructuring of the teacher preparation program began earlier, the state grant funding then accelerated this process allowing the university to schedule more field-based involvement at all levels starting in the fall semester, 1995. Contexts for interaction of public school teachers and preservice teachers, university faculty and public school teachers, and for the mix of public school teachers, preservice teachers, and university faculty increased dramatically. A learning community was created.

The transactions among this community of learners helped to foster the grant's far reaching goals. Mentors assisted in the professional development of future teachers and also had the opportunity to experience further professional growth for themselves through mentoring. Preservice teachers had in-depth classroom teaching/learning experiences with small and large groups of students and also gained understandings about campus organization and climate.

These field experiences focused on the last three semesters of the teacher preparation program. For the first field-based course, a Reading/Language Arts block of six credit hours involved the preservice teachers in assigned classrooms for approximately one and one-half to two hours twice a week. The mentors guided preservice teachers in their roles as teaching assistants and also supported them in several whole class interactions.

In the following semester, preservice teachers had blocked Methods courses of math, social studies, science, and reading wherein they spent approximately ten to twelve full days in assigned classrooms. One day a week they took responsibility as teaching assistants and taught short activity lessons in addition to tutoring a child chosen by the mentor for assistance in reading and writing. They also taught a full week of an integrated

unit covering all content areas and continued to tutor their assigned student an hour each day. The mentor teachers assisted as needed, debriefed with them daily, and also assessed their performance in a conference setting and with written evaluations.

In the final student teaching semester, the mentor teachers through daily, ongoing interactions helped the student teachers gradually take over responsibility for teaching the class for three to four weeks in the six week assignment. The student teachers then moved to another grade level and repeated the experience of assisting, preparing, and then teaching for three to four weeks. Each of the mentors worked daily with the student teacher, offering suggestions, assisting, debriefing, and also evaluating with the state teacher appraisal instrument.

Over the two and one-half years of the grant, it was possible for a classroom teacher to mentor in one, two or all three of these formats, therefore, creating seven different categories of teacher experience with mentoring.

Several of the definitions found in the literature for mentoring were evident in the reflections of the mentor teachers and preservice teachers throughout the two and one-half years of the grant. Professional and personal growth appeared as a focus of the nurturing role of mentoring (Anderson and Shannon, 1988). Also, collegial support as highlighted by Playco (1990) became evident as a major component in the Reading/Language Arts Block and the Methods Block interactions among classroom teachers, preservice teachers, and the on-site university teachers. Finding the skills preservice teachers did not know existed and then demanding more than they thought available (Bennis, 1994, p. 91), surfaced often in the descriptions of experiences. Mentors also spoke of their role as guiding and overseeing the activities of the preservice teachers, much like Zey's (1991) concept of a mentor as an overseer of protégés.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed:

Question 1. What differences exist in scores on each of the 7 school teacher leadership factors as rated by the seven subsets of teacher mentors?

Question 2. What relationship does time taught on a campus, years of experience teaching, age, gender, grade level taught and number of semesters in the SHCPD, have with the scores on the 7 school teacher leadership factors?

Question 3: How are teacher leadership factors ranked by the entire sample of teacher mentors?

Question 4. How are teacher leadership factors ranked by each subset of teacher mentors?

Limitations of the Study

Where subsets of the total sample ($n=116$) were used in part to make the analysis, generalization of the findings may not be made. Subsets of mentor teachers according to mentor experience(s) were: Group 1-mentoring preservice teachers in a methods block, $n=10$; Group 2-mentoring preservice teachers in a reading/language arts block, $n=11$; Group 3-mentoring teachers in student teaching, reading/language arts and methods blocks, $n=49$; Group 4-mentoring preservice teachers in both student teaching and methods block, $n=7$; Group 5-mentoring student teachers, $n=19$; Group 6-mentoring preservice teachers in student teaching and the methods block, $n=19$; Group 7-mentoring preservice teachers in reading language arts and the methods block, $n=1$.

Another possible limitation of the study is that other variables that may impact the perceptions of teachers--variables that are indigenous to the situation--were not considered.

Methods and Data Analysis

Elementary inservice teachers in six elementary schools who had served as mentors during one or more of the five semesters of the SHCPD's operation in one of the partnership districts were surveyed using the Teacher School Leadership Survey (Katzenmeyer & Katzenmeyer, 1997). One hundred and sixteen of one hundred and ninety mentors returned the survey for a return rate of 61%. Types of mentoring experiences were noted and the scores on the seven factors were analyzed using ANOVA to determine if there were any significant differences in mean scores on the seven factors supporting teacher leadership. Range of scores for each teacher leadership factor was also used to indicate variance.

Demographic factors such as experience at that campus, number of semesters in the SHCPD, age, gender, grade level assignments were recorded and correlated with the scores on the 7 factors using a simple Pearson r .

Means of each of the scores for all seven factors were ranked according to each subset of teacher mentors in each of the seven mentoring experience(s).

Means of factors #2- #7, recognition, autonomy, collegiality, participation, open communication and positive environment, were ranked over the entire sample of mentors. The mean of the total sample from factor #1, developmental focus, was not compared with the means of factors #2-#7 because an extra question was associated with this factor.

Both sets of rankings, whether determined by subset or the total sample, provided information that could help analyze what processes and structures might be improved to provide further support for teacher leadership, or alternately to identify barriers that must be removed or diminished if teacher leadership is to flourish.

Findings

Research Question 1. What differences exist in scores on each of the 7 school teacher leadership factors as rated by the seven subsets of teacher mentors? Results of the ANOVA showed no significant differences on mean scores of the seven factors for school leadership for each of the kinds of mentoring. Thus the type of mentoring (all of which involved the interaction of professors, preservice teachers and teachers) appeared not to significantly influence the perception that mentors had of the seven factors in the "Teacher Leadership School Survey", factors related to campus support teacher leadership.

The range of scores indicated variance in the scoring of the 7 school teacher leadership factors across the sample. The information is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Teacher Leadership Factor	Range in Scores	Teacher Leadership Factor	Range in Scores
Developmental Focus	17	Participation	19
Recognition	18	Open Communication	18
Autonomy	18	Positive Environment	20
Collegiality	18		

With a total possible score of 35 on 6 of the 7 factors (Developmental Focus had a possible total score of 40), one can see the variance is equal to at least half of the score possible in six of the seven factors.

Research Question 2. What relationship does time taught on a campus, years of experience, teaching, age, gender, grade level taught and number of semesters in the SHCPD, have with the scores on the 7 school teacher leadership factors? Only two of the demographic variables of the teacher mentors appeared to have a significant positive correlation with school teacher leadership factors. Years of experience of the teacher at the home campus showed a positive correlation of $p < .05$ with school teacher leadership factors of recognition and developmental focus. Another variable, years in teaching, appeared also to have a significant positive correlation, $p < .05$, with the school teacher leadership factor developmental focus.

Research Question 3. How are teacher leadership factors ranked by the entire sample of teacher mentors? Ranking of six factors as scored by the inservice teacher mentors showed the following in terms of strength, from strongest to weakest, for school support of teacher leadership: 1) recognition, 2) positive environment, 3) open communication, 4) participation, 5) collegiality and 6) autonomy. The factor, developmental focus, was not ranked as it included an extra question.

Research Question 4: How are teacher leadership factors ranked by each subset of teacher mentors? This second type of ranking matched the type or types of mentoring experiences noted by a teacher with each of the seven teacher leadership school factors.

Subsets of teachers identified by differing mentoring experiences showed differing views of school support for school teacher leadership as seen in Table 2.

Table 2
Rankings of Teacher Leadership Factors by Subsets of Mentors

Leadership Factors	Mentoring Subsets by Experiences (#1-#7)*						
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7
1. Developmental Focus**	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
2. Recognition	3	1	1	1~	2	1~	4
3. Autonomy	2	4	3	3	3	1~	1
4. Collegiality	5~	5~	5	4	4	5	3
5. Participation	5~	5~	4	5	6	2	6
6. Open communication	4	3	6	1~	5	4	5
7. Positive environment	1	2	2	2	1	3	2

~ = Tied ranking.

*#1 Methods, #2 Reading/Language Arts, #3 Student Teaching, Reading/Language Arts and Methods, #4 Student Teaching and Methods, #5 Student Teaching, #6 Student Teaching and Reading Language Arts, #7 Reading Language Arts and Methods.

** Developmental focus was not ranked as the factor included extra weighting with an additional question.

Discussion

As Katzenmeyer and Moller (1996) indicate, understanding and knowing the factors supporting teacher leadership are keys to developing teacher leaders. Providing the mentoring experiences is not enough. The range in scores in each dimension by the entire set of mentor teachers indicates certainly that some teachers saw obstacles for each of the school teacher leadership factors to be in place. Barriers to teacher leadership exist without being recognized by those involved. Practices and policies as well as budgets and people can be involved. Administrators, teachers, professors and others active in such as the PDS efforts are sometimes not involved in the planning or implementation in such a way as to gain their commitment to the same vision that some at higher levels may have for the PDS.

From another perspective of what constitutes real change, we have learned once again that a great plan without consideration of the political structure and its entities will amount to much work and frustration with little real change (Allington, 1996). In this situation of fostering educational leadership in mentoring teachers, the power structure at the campus level must also commit to labor intensive efforts to create a differing management structure.

In other words, the power structure must allow inservice teachers varying opportunities to exercise their leadership qualities, if indeed these qualities are developed from field based experiences.

The new impetus in many states from state policy makers has effectively reversed the movement of the last decade towards more involvement of faculty for consensus building and site-based management. New policies from state legislatures and executive branches have imposed numerous mandates for educational accountability systems.

Where does this leave campus administrators? It leaves them with little autonomy themselves and with almost none to pass on to campus teachers. The Professional Development Center in this study had to deal with new accountability mandates during the first year of the grant. These new accountability policies seemed to have relevance to teacher responses as some of the mentor teachers added "we used to..., but not now" on their survey instrument as they responded to questions regarding their opportunities for campus decision making.

The data seems to infer that in some cases newly developed leadership skills of mentor teachers go unused or under-used, and their ensuing frustration only mounts as they become more empowered with new learning, further study, and new insights.

Fullan (1993) writes that the change process in education involves complex and conservative systems; therefore, to plan for successful change, the system must change. New interactions, new models, and new reforms, however, are often nonsystemic. Teachers and all educators cannot work alone for change and be successful.

Results of the rankings of the means of the school teacher leadership factors by the mentoring experiences of teachers certainly seem to indicate that the mentoring experience of individual teachers may be related to differing views of school support for teachers serving as leaders. These views may well be more related to the vast prior experiences of the mentors. It appears that extended length of career teaching and the extended length of one campus assignment may have as much influence on views of campus support for teacher leadership as 1-3 semesters of mentoring.

Although the involvement of others was widespread in planning the SHCPD, an analysis of the level and kind of involvement during implementation would probably prove helpful in learning where the change process might be improved. If systems must change through the creation of learning organizations and communities, then educators have little time to waste to prepare students, professors, teachers and administrators to be in true learning communities to increase individuals' capacities to lead us into the 21st century.

Implications for the Future--Next Steps

Analysis of preservice teachers' self-assessments and reflections of field experiences is planned as well as further study linking these efforts to student achievement .

References

Anderson, B.M. & Shannon, A.C. (1988). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. *Journal of Teacher Education*, Jan.-Feb., 38-42.

Allington, R. and Walmsley, S.(1996). No Quick Fix. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bennis, W. (1994). On becoming a leader. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Berry, B. and Catoe, S. (1994). Creating professional development schools: Policy and practice in South Carolina's PDS initiative. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.) Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 176-202). New York. Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. Bullmaster, M.L., and Cobb, V.L. (1995). Rethinking Teacher Leadership Through Professional Development Schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96 (1), 21-40.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change Forces: Probing Depths of Educational Reform. New York: The Falmer Press.

Dempsey, R. (1992). Teachers As Leaders: towards a conceptual Framework, *Teaching Education*, 5 (1) 113-120.

Gehrke, N.J. and Romerdahl, N.S. (1992, April). *Role personalization of teacher leaders in a professional development school*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco.

Gehrke, N.J. and Romerdahl, N.S. (1997). Teacher Leaders: Making a Difference in Schools. West Lafayette, Indiana. Kappa Delta Pi.

Hart, A. W. (1995). Reconceiving School Leadership: emergent views. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96 (1), 9-28.

Hart, A.W. and Bredeson, P.W. (1996). The principalship: Toward professional learning and practice. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.

Hayes, H., Wetherill, K., Tyndall, R.E., Hayes, A. and Calhoun, D. (1996). *A New Vision for Schools, Supervision, and Teacher Education: The Professional*

Development System and Model Clinical Teaching Project. Paper presented to annual meeting of the special interest group: instructional supervision. American Educational Research Association, New York.

Katzenmeyer, M. and Moller, G. (1996). Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Leadership Development for Teachers. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press.

Katzenmeyer, M. and William Katzenmeyer (1997). Phone call and fax on December 4, 1997.

Katzenmeyer, W. (1997). Phone call on December 12, 1997.

Lemleek, J.K., Hertzog-Foliart, H. and Hackl, A. (1994). *The Los Angeles professional practice school: A study of mutual impact*. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.) *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession* (pp. 156-175). New York: Teachers College Press.

McDaniel, J.E., Rice, C. and Romerdahl, N.S. (1990, April). *Building teacher leadership in an emerging professional development center*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Murray, F.B. (1993). "All or None" criteria for professional development schools. in P.G. Altbach, H.G. Petrie, M.J. Shujaa and L. Weiss (Eds.), *Educational Policy: Volume 7, Number 1*. Professional development schools (pp. 61-73). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk. Education Department, Washington, D.C..

Playco, M. (1990) What it means to be mentored. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74, 526, 29-32.

Sam Houston State University (1995). Sam Houston Center for Professional Development, Grant Proposal for the Texas Education Agency, Huntsville, Texas.

Senge, P.M. (1990). Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Smylie, M.A. (1995). New Perspectives on Teacher Leadership. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96 (1), 3-8.

Zey, M.G. (1991). The mentorship connection. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.

Authors

Dr. Marion Czaja

email: edu_mxc@shsu.edu

Marion Czaja has 33 years of experience in education. She has served as a teacher, assistant principal, acting principal, curriculum director, and superintendent of schools. Now Associate Professor of Educational Leadership at Sam Houston State University, she has a specific research interest in the superintendency with a current focus on superintendent training and preparation. Leadership in public schools at all levels remains a broad research interest.

Dr. Joan LivingstonProuty

email: edu_jlp@shsu.edu

Joan Prouty is an Associate Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Department of Language, Literacy, and Special Populations at Sam Houston State University. She has been and continues to be an active participant in preparing teacher leaders through the Sam Houston Center for Professional Development and other university efforts. Her background includes speech pathology and audiology, teacher of the deaf and the deaf-blind, reading specialist and literacy and content emphasis of field-based courses. Teacher leadership and particularly mentoring remain key areas of research interest.